REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. Claims 1-20 have been rejected. Claims 1, 8, 13, and 20 have been amended. Support for the claim amendments can be found at least on page 10, lines 4-32 of the specification. No new matter has been added. In view of foregoing amendments and following remarks, Applicants request allowance of the Application.

Claim Objections

Claim 20 is objected to because of an antecedent basis issue with respect to the phrase "the middleware server". Claim 20 has been amended to correct the antecedent basis issue. Withdrawal of the claim objection to claim 20 is respectfully requested.

CLAIMS 1-20 ARE FULLY SUPPORTED BY THE SPECIFICATION AND ARE DEFINITE

35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to include support in the specification for the limitations "querying, in the descriptor file, a registry associated with the mobile device to determine whether to configure the mobile device using the determined associated configuration parameter" and "if the determine associated configuration parameter is not located in the registry associated with the mobile device, initiating a process...", as recited in claim 1.

These limitations recited in claim 1 are supported by the specification. For instance, page 8, lines 26-29 of the specification recite that a mobile solution descriptor maintains a representation of a registry for each mobile device – "in particular, the resources that are current (sic) installed on the mobile device with respect to the associated mobile application solution." The specification further states that the synchronization process between a mobile device and the middleware server includes both a determination by the middleware server of appropriate resources to be deployed to a mobile device (specification, p. 10, lines 6-10) and a determination of whether application resources deployed at a mobile device need to be updated (specification, p. 10, lines 29-33). In determining appropriate resources to deploy to a mobile device, the middleware server queries an application solution database, including the mobile solution descriptor file. Specification, p. 10, lines 7-21. From this foregoing description, one of

ordinary skill in the art would readily understand that during synchronization between a mobile device and a middleware server, the mobile solution descriptor file, which maintains separate registries for each mobile device, would necessarily be queried to determine an appropriate application resource to deploy to a particular mobile device. Moreover, since the deployment of application resources from the middleware server to a mobile device occurs in response to a synchronization request, one of ordinary skill in the art would readily understand that an application resource would be deployed only if the resource is not located in the registry maintained by the descriptor file.

Accordingly, Applicants submit the specification fully supports the limitations of claim 1 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. For similar reasons as discussed above, claims 8, 13, and 20 also are fully supported by the specification. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 112, first paragraph, rejection of claims 1-20.

35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being allegedly indefinite with respect to the recitation of "a registry" in connection with the "querying" limitation relative to the recitation of "a registry" in connection with the "storing, at the middleware server, in a descriptor file a registry" limitation of claim 1. Claims 8, 13, and 20 stand rejected for similar rationales.

Applicants have amended claims 1, 8, 13, and 20 to address the indefiniteness issue. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 112, second paragraph, rejection of claims 1-20.

CLAIMS 1-20 DEFINE OVER MULTER IN VIEW OF SONG AND FURTHER IN VIEW OF VERT AND CHASMAN

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over US Pub. No. 2002/0040369 to Multer et al., (hereinafter "Multer"), in view of US Pub. No. 2003/0065947 to Song et al., (hereinafter "Song"), and further in view of US Pub. No. 2001/0008019 to Vert et al., (hereinafter "Vert"), and US Pub. No. 2007/0180075 to Chasman et al., (hereinafter "Chasman").

Multer, Song, Vert, and Chasman, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest every limitation of independent claims 1, 8, 13, and 20, as is required to maintain a proper § 103(a) rejection.

Consider, claim 1, as amended, which recites in part the following subject matter:

> if the determined associated configuration parameter is not located in the registry associated with the mobile device,
> ***generating a resource ID from both the associated device profile and the associated configuration parameter;***
> ***retrieving an application resource*** for the mobile device ***using the generated resource ID***; and
> configuring the mobile device using the retrieved application resource.

Multer fails to teach or suggest this subject matter. Multer discusses a pull synchronization scenario between a device and a server. In the pull synchronization scenario, data on the device is updated using a difference or delta update obtained from the server. Multer, paragraphs [0224]-[0227]. While the synchronization process uses a device name and a device class to identify a device type that is being synchronized (*see* Multer, paragraph [0223]), the server does not use this device type or any configuration parameter to generate a resource ID that identifies the data to be deployed to the device. Rather, the data used to synchronize a device with a server is assigned a "Universally Unique Identifier (UUID)", with each UUID having "a unique 128 bit value which by may assigned by the system provider" (emphasis added). Multer, paragraph [0249]-[0250]. This assigned identifier is not generated from both a device profile and a configuration parameter. Thus, Multer clearly does not teach or suggest the above-recited subject matter of claim 1.

Song does not remedy the deficiencies of Multer. Song is directed to a registry architecture for securely sharing personal devices among different users. *See* Song, Abstract. As such, Song lacks any disclosure of configuring a software application on a mobile device in communication with a middleware server using the above-recited subject matter of claim 1.

Vert also fails to remedy the deficiencies of Multer and Song. Vert generally discusses "a method and system for transparently failing over a legacy application from a first system to a second system of a server cluster by tracking and checkpointing changes to application configuration information stored in a system's local registry". Vert, Abstract. As part of the failing over process, data to be checkpointed, such as registry data, is referenced by "a resource ID (a globally unique identifier or GUID) and a unique checkpoint ID, which is an

arbitrary DWORD." Vert, paragraph [0052] (emphasis added). Thus, Vert's identifiers for checkpointed data are not generated from a device profile and configuration parameter, as is recited in claim 1. For at least this reason, Vert does not remedy the deficiencies of Multer and Song.

Chasman also fails to remedy the deficiencies of Multer, Song, and Vert. Chasman generally discusses the synchronization of objects in a master database and a replicated database using identifiers and version stamps of the objects. Chasman's identifiers are assigned by a sync server and are "determined by a combination of object type and identifier properties, which simplifies identifier assignments for new object instances". Thus, Chasman's identifiers also are not generated based on a device profile and a configuration parameter, as is recited in claim 1.

For at least this reason, Multer, Song, Vert, and Chasman fail to teach or suggest every element of independent claim 1, as is required to maintain a proper § 103(a) rejection. Independent claims 8, 13, and 20 are not rendered obvious by these references for similar reasons. Claims 2-7, 9-12, and 14-19 depend from independent claims 1, 8, and 13 and are similarly not rendered obvious for these reasons. Applicants therefore respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

CONCLUSION

All outstanding rejections have been overcome. In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the application is in clear condition for allowance. Issuance of a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Although not believed necessary, the Office is hereby authorized to charge any fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17 or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 11-0600.

The Office is invited to contact the undersigned at (408) 975-7500 to discuss any matter regarding this application.

Respectfully submitted,

KENYON & KENYON LLP

Date: January 26, 2009

/Mark D. Yuan/
Mark D. Yuan
(Registration No.: 57,312)

Kenyon & Kenyon LLP
333 West San Carlos Street, Suite 600
San Jose, CA 95110

Telephone: (408) 975-7500
Facsimile: (408) 975-7501